

2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report Template

For instructions and guidelines visit our [website](#)
or [contact us](#) for more help.

Report: Ed. D Educational Leadership

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1.

Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs) **did you assess?** [Check all that apply]

- ☒ 1. Critical Thinking
- ☒ 2. Information Literacy
- ☒ 3. Written Communication
- ☐ 4. Oral Communication
- ☒ 5. Quantitative Literacy
- ☒ 6. Inquiry and Analysis
- ☒ 7. Creative Thinking
- ☐ 8. Reading
- ☐ 9. Team Work
- ☒ 10. Problem Solving
- ☒ 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- ☒ 12. Intercultural Knowledge and Competency
- ☒ 13. Ethical Reasoning
- ☒ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- ☐ 15. Global Learning
- ☒ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- ☒ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- ☒ 18. Overall Competencies in the Major/Discipline
- ☐ 19. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

- a.
- b.
- c.

Q1.2.

Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information such as how your specific PLOs are **explicitly** linked to the Sac State BLGs:

We assessed critical analysis, integrative thinking, ability to assess effective communication to education stakeholders, understanding the professional role of educational leaders and research, practical applications of research, practice and policy, assessing knowledge and ethics in leadership, problem solving and applied learning for equity.

Q1.2.1.

Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

- ☒ 1. Yes, for all PLOs
- ☐ 2. Yes, but for some PLOs
- ☐ 3. No rubrics for PLOs
- ☐ 4. N/A
- ☐ 5. Other, specify:

Q1.3.

Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

Q1.4.

Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No (skip to **Q1.5**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q1.5**)

Q1.4.1.

If the answer to Q1.4 is **yes**, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

Q1.5.

Did your program use the *Degree Qualification Profile* (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No, but I know what the DQP is
- ☒ 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is
- ☐ 4. Don't know

Q1.6.

Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO

Q2.1.

Select **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the correct box* for this PLO in Q1.1):

Critical Thinking

Q2.1.1.

Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

Where appropriate, the response demonstrates a clear and convincing critical analysis by:

- Providing a thorough explanation of the problem.
- Providing a convincing argument to either support or refute the case study's research design/application. When the research design/application is not provided, an appropriate and comprehensive alternative research design is described.
- Providing consistent evidence of recognizing the interchange between theory and practice and practice and theory.
- Appropriately addressing the ethical implications of choices.

Effectively identifying and addressing critical issues/facets not readily apparent in the case study.

Q2.2.

Has the program developed or adopted **explicit** standards of performance for this PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know
- ☐ 4. N/A

Q2.3.

Please **provide the rubric(s)** and **standards of performance** that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix.

Provides consistently strong evidence	Revise: Provides evidence with some weaknesses	Fail: Provides little or no evidence
<p>appropriate, the response demonstrates a clear and convincing critical analysis by:</p> <p>Providing a thorough explanation of the problem.</p> <p>Providing a convincing argument to either support or refute the case study's research design/application. When the research design/application is not provided, an appropriate and comprehensive alternative research design is described.</p> <p>Providing consistent evidence of recognizing the interchange between theory and practice and practice and theory.</p> <p>Appropriately addressing the ethical implications of choices.</p> <p>Effectively identifying and addressing critical issues/facets not readily apparent in the case study</p>	<p>The response demonstrates an insufficient analysis by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing a superficial explanation of the problem. • Providing a weak argument to either support or refute the case study's research design/application. When the research design/application is not provided, an appropriate but incomplete alternative research design is provided. • Providing some evidence of recognizing the interchange between theory and practice and practice and theory. • Insufficiently addressing the ethical implications of choices. • Insufficiently identifying and addressing critical issues/facets not readily apparent in the case study 	<p>The response demonstrates inadequate critical analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing an incorrect or inappropriate explanation of the problem, or none at all • Providing an inappropriate incomplete argument to support or refute the case study's research design/application. When the research design/application is not provided, an inappropriate alternative research design or none at all is provided. • Providing little or no evidence of recognizing the interchange between theory and practice and practice and theory • Inadequately addressing the ethical implications of choices • Inadequately identifying and/or addressing critical issues/facets not readily apparent in the case study

No file attached

No file attached

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdrd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the PLO , the standard of performance, and the rubric that was used to measure the PLO:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
			3. In the student handbook/advising handbook

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. In the university catalogue
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10. Other, specify: <input type="text"/>

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

Q3.1.

Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No (skip to Q6)
☐ 3. Don't know (skip to Q6)
☐ 4. N/A (skip to Q6)

Q3.1.1.

How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO?

Q3.2.

Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No (skip to Q6)
☐ 3. Don't know (skip to Q6)
☐ 4. N/A (skip to Q6)

Q3.2.1.

Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected:

Students sat for 8 hours for entire exam. Faculty met to synthesized and coordinate assessment approach relative to rubric. Two graders examined each PLO on the Qualifying Exam. Students were given pass, fail or revise. All students that were given a revise were then reviewed again by two faculty members and deemed pass or fail.

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

Q3.3.

Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to Q3.7)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to Q3.7)

Q3.3.1.

Which of the following direct measures were used? [Check all that apply]

- ☒ 1. Capstone project (e.g. theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
- ☐ 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program
- ☐ 3. Key assignments from elective classes
- ☐ 4. Classroom based performance assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques
- ☐ 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects
- ☐ 6. E-Portfolios
- ☐ 7. Other Portfolios
- ☐ 8. Other, specify:

Q3.3.2.

Please **explain** and **attach** the direct measure you used to collect data:



No file attached



No file attached

Q3.4.

What tool was used to evaluate the data?

- ☐ 1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to Q3.4.4.)
- ☐ 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to Q3.4.2.)
- ☐ 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to Q3.4.2.)
- ☐ 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to Q3.4.2.)
- ☐ 5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to Q3.4.2.)
- ☐ 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to Q3.4.2.)
- ☒ 7. Used other means (Answer Q3.4.1.)

Q3.4.1.

If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [Check all that apply]

- ☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to Q3.4.4.)
- ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to Q3.4.4.)
- ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to Q3.4.4.)
- ☒ 4. Other, specify: (skip to Q3.4.4.)

Q3.4.2.

Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

- ☒ 1. Yes

- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know
- ☐ 4. N/A

Q3.4.3.

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the rubric**?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know
- ☐ 4. N/A

Q3.4.4.

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know
- ☐ 4. N/A

Q3.5.

How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

8

Q3.5.1.

How many faculty members participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

10

Q3.5.2.

If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know
- ☐ 4. N/A

Q3.6.

How did you **select** the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?

All reviewed

Q3.6.1.

How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

All reviewed

Q3.6.2.

How many students were in the class or program?

12

Q3.6.3.

How many samples of student work did you evaluated?

12, All reviewed

Q3.6.4.

Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

Q3.7.

Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

- ☐ 1. Yes
☒ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8**)
☐ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8**)

Q3.7.1.

Which of the following indirect measures were used? [Check all that apply]

- ☐ 1. National student surveys (e.g. NSSE)
☐ 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)
☐ 3. College/department/program student surveys or focus groups
☐ 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
☐ 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
☐ 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
☐ 7. Other, specify:

Q3.7.1.1.

Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:

We do plan to distribute a survey of new alumni via survey monkey.



No file attached



No file attached

Q3.7.2.

If surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?

Q3.7.3.

If surveys were used, how did you **select** your sample:

Q3.7.4.

If surveys were used, what was the response rate?

Question 3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)

Q3.8.

Were external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8.2**)
- ☐ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

Q3.8.1.

Which of the following measures was used? [Check all that apply]

- ☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams

- ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.)
- ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.)
- ☒ 4. Other, specify:

Q3.8.2.

Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

Q3.8.3.

If other measures were used, please specify:

 No file attached

 No file attached

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

Q4.1.

Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO for **Q2.1**:

3 students passed in the first round of assessment on the qualifying exam while 9 were given a revise.

After the second round of revision by students, who were given a week to revise, all 12 students met the standards.


 No file attached

 No file attached

Q4.2.

Are students doing well and meeting the program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

Yes, but we are starting a new volunteer blended writing seminar to begin the year. It will be focused on new students, but it will be open to all of the cohorts in the doctorate.

 No file attached No file attached**Q4.3.**

For the selected PLO, the student performance:

- ☒ 1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard
- ☐ 2. **Met** expectation/standard
- ☐ 3. **Partially** met expectation/standard
- ☐ 4. Did not meet expectation/standard
- ☐ 5. No expectation/standard has been specified
- ☐ 6. Don't know

Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

Q4.4.

Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

Q4.5.

Were **all** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

Q5.1.

As a result of the assessment effort and based on prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate *making any changes* for your program (e.g. course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No (skip to **Q5.2**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q5.2**)

Q5.1.1.

Please describe *what changes* you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes.

Q5.1.2.

Do you have a plan to assess the *impact of the changes* that you anticipate making?

- ☐ 1. Yes
☒ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

Q5.2.

How have the assessment data from the last annual assessment been used so far? **[Check all that apply]**

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Improving specific courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Modifying curriculum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Improving advising and mentoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Annual assessment reports	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Program review	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Prospective student and family information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
10. Alumni communication	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
12. Program accreditation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
13. External accountability reporting requirement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Strategic planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Institutional benchmarking	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. Academic policy development or modifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. Institutional improvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. New faculty hiring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Recruitment of new students	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

23. Other, specify:

Q5.2.1.

Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above:

In our strategic planning conversation in faculty meeting we have discussed potential revising courses in the typical sequence for the course to better align with the assessment. We have also discussed revisting the Qualifying Exam process. We also discuss our PLOs with potential students to provide a contrast for our program with other for-profit competitors.

(Remember: Save your progress)

Additional Assessment Activities

Q6.

Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspect of their program *that are not related to the PLOs* (i.e. impacts of an advising center, etc.). **If** your program/academic unit has collected data on program *elements*, please briefly report your results here:



No file attached



No file attached

Q7.

What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? **[Check all that apply]**

- ☒ 1. Critical Thinking
- ☒ 2. Information Literacy
- ☒ 3. Written Communication
- ☐ 4. Oral Communication
- ☒ 5. Quantitative Literacy
- ☒ 6. Inquiry and Analysis
- ☒ 7. Creative Thinking
- ☒ 8. Reading
- ☐ 9. Team Work
- ☒ 10. Problem Solving
- ☒ 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- ☒ 12. Intercultural Knowledge and Competency
- ☒ 13. Ethical Reasoning
- ☒ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- ☒ 15. Global Learning
- ☒ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- ☒ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- ☒ 18. Overall Competencies in the Major/Discipline
- ☐ 19. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:

a.

b.

c.

Q8. Please attach any additional files here:

No file attached



No file attached



No file attached



No file attached

Q8.1.

Have you attached any files to this form? If yes, please list every attached file here:

Program Information (Required)

P1.

Program/Concentration Name(s): [by degree]

Ed. D Educational Leadership

P1.1.

Program/Concentration Name(s): [by department]

Educational Leadership Ed. D

P2.

Report Author(s):

Julian Vasquez Heilig

P2.1.

Department Chair/Program Director:

Julian Vasquez Heilig

P2.2.

Assessment Coordinator:

Julian Vasquez Heilig

P3.

Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit

Education - Graduate

P4.

College:

College of Education

P5.

Total enrollment for Academic Unit during assessment semester (see Departmental Fact Book):

48

P6.

Program Type:

☐

1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major

☐

2. Credential

☐ 3. Master's Degree

☒ 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)

☐ 5. Other, specify:

P7. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

N/A

P7.1. List all the names:

P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

N/A

P8. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

N/A

P8.1. List all the names:

P8.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

N/A

P9. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

N/A

P9.1. List all the names:

P10. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

1

P10.1. List all the names:

Doctorate in Educational Leadership

When was your assessment plan ...	1. Before 2010-11	2. 2011-12	3. 2012-13	4. 2013-14	5. 2014-15	6. No Plan	7. Don't know
P11. developed?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
P11.1. last updated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

P11.3.

Please attach your latest **assessment plan**:

 No file attached


P12.

Has your program developed a **curriculum map**?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

P12.1.

Please attach your latest **curriculum map**:

 Graduate Learning Goals_Objectives_call October 2015 2.docx
36.73 KB

P13.

Has your program indicated in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

P14.

Does your program have a capstone class?

- ☒ 1. Yes, indicate:
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

P14.1.

Does your program have **any** capstone project?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

(**Remember:** Save your progress)

Graduate Learning Goals/Objectives Policy

The Faculty Senate recommends that departments/interdisciplinary groups with graduate programs in their purview be required to establish Graduate Goals/Objectives, Program Learning Outcomes with an associated curriculum map, and an assessment plan with an associated action plan, to be submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies within one full academic year of approval of this policy (Approved in May 2015). Items in *italics* are additional elements being requested to assist with institutional level data collection.

Graduate Learning Goals/Objectives and Program Learning Outcomes

The Faculty Senate further recommends that in developing graduate learning goals/objectives, faculty consult resources such as the information submitted in the Instructional Program Priorities (IPP) process, the Graduate Learning Goals recommended by the Graduate Studies Policies Committee, and/or the Lumina Foundation Degree Qualifications Profile in framing their learning goals/objectives and assessment components.

Graduate programs shall develop Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) that represent their unique perspectives. Each graduate program shall define its own set of learning outcomes, specific to the level of study and to the discipline, which are clearly more advanced in content than those defined for related undergraduate work. For some programs, these might already be defined, at least in part, by external accrediting agencies. Such defined outcomes shall also form the basis for assessment plans within graduate programs and offer foci for future academic program review terms.

Program Learning Outcomes are designed with the goal of placing graduated master's or doctoral students into post-degree positions in secondary education, non-profits, business and consulting, government and private agencies, and other fields that draw on the knowledge and skills of graduates in the focused areas of their degree preparation.

Graduate Learning Objectives	Program Learning Outcomes
PLO 1 Critical Analysis	We expect students to be able to undertake clear and convincing critical analysis by: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Providing a thorough explanation of the problem.• Providing a convincing argument to either support or refute the case study's research design/application. When the research design/application is not provided, an appropriate and comprehensive alternative research design is described.• Providing consistent evidence of recognizing the interchange between theory and practice and practice and theory.• Appropriately addressing the ethical implications of choices. Effectively identifying and addressing critical issues/facets not readily apparent.
PLO 2 Integrative Thinking	Where appropriate, we expect students clearly incorporates the following skills: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Providing a thorough analysis of relevant economic concepts.• Providing a thorough analysis of relevant budgeting and organizational concepts.• Providing a thorough analysis of the socio-political environment.• Providing a thorough analysis of the cultural context. Providing a thorough analysis of the legal context.
PLO 3 Effective Communication to K-14 Stakeholders	Where appropriate, students should demonstrate mastery of the following elements by: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Maintaining a professional tone that is appropriate to the audience and purpose of the writing.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presenting a clearly organized and focused response in writing activities. The writer's progression of ideas is coherent and logical. Maintaining consistent control of standard writing conventions (e.g., spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, usage, paragraphing, APA guidelines) and using conventions effectively to enhance readability. Errors tend to be few. Exhibiting an awareness that leadership discourse requires clarity of thought, honesty of intent, and a sense of respect in order for effective communication with all stakeholders to take place, especially with the diverse communities one serves or wishes to serve. <p>Exhibiting an understanding that culture, values, and beliefs seriously influence the way we communicate and the way others perceive our message.</p>
PLO 4 Understanding Professional Role	<p>Where appropriate, students should be able to offer a clear and convincing explanation of the following elements by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing a thorough discussion of the role of federal/California policy context. Providing a thorough discussion of the role of public/private/non-profit sectors. Providing a thorough discussion of the role and ethics of the education workplace. Providing a thorough discussion of the role of parent/community engagement. Providing a thorough discussion of the role of stakeholder accountability.
PLO 5 Practical Applications	<p>Where appropriate, student should be able to craft a clear and convincing recognition of the following elements by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing a thorough discussion of the data collection and analysis processes. Providing a thorough explanation of the relationship between and significance of the influence of data on decision and policy-making processes. Providing a thorough discussion of the role of supervision, evaluation, and professional development. <p>Providing a thorough discussion of the role of collective bargaining, appraisal, and compensation,</p>
PLO 6 Leadership	<p>Where appropriate, students should be able to clearly and convincingly demonstrates an understanding of the following elements by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing a thorough discussion of the role of an organization's mission.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing a thorough discussion of the role of strategic planning and management. Providing a thorough discussion of the role of conflict resolution and problem solving. <p>Providing a thorough discussion of the role of collaboration and team building, and the characteristics necessary for effective leadership.</p>
PLO 7 Equity	<p>Where appropriate, students can clearly and convincingly demonstrate a consideration of the following elements by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing a thorough explanation of diversity and equity issues and their implications. Providing a thorough discussion of the issues related to the promotion of access, retention, and equity. Providing a thorough discussion of the issues related to undoing institutional barriers, setting high expectations, and culturally responsive instructional leadership. <p>Providing a thorough explanation of the intersection of language and education structures.</p>

Curriculum Map

Each program shall create a curriculum map:

- List all courses, both required and elective, as well as other required graduate education activities.
- Indicate where in the curriculum each PLO is addressed through development of a curriculum map. The curriculum map may be presented in many formats, including tabular form as the template below. Another format may be substituted
- Please indicate if the course is a core (C), an elective (E), or culminating experience (Thesis, Project, or Comprehensive Examination) course.

Course Work (Unit and Type)			PLO 1	PLO 2	PLO 3	PLO 4	PLO 5	PLO 6	PLO 7
(3) (C)	EDD 600*	Transformational Leadership	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
(3) (C)	EDD 602*	Policy and Practice for Educational Leaders I	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
(3) (C)	EDD 604*	Data-driven Decision-making for Educational Leaders	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
(3) (C)	EDD 605*	Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods I	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
(3) (C)	EDD 607*	Community and Communication in Educational Leadership	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
(3) (C)	EDD 608*	Diversity and Equity in Complex Organizations	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
(3) (C)	EDD 609*	Human Resource Management	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
(3) (C)	EDD 610*	Curriculum Management	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
(3) (C)	EDD 601*	Organizational Leadership and Change	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
(3) (C)	EDD 603*	Policy and Practice for Educational Leaders II	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
(3) (C)	EDD 606*	Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods II	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
(2) (C)	EDD 611*	Legal Issues for Educational Leaders	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
(2) (C)	EDD 612*	Student Services in Education	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
(2) (C)	EDD 613*	Finance and Budget for Educational Leaders	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
(3) (C)	EDD 614*	Issues in Educational Leadership: Application and Synthesis	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
(6) (C)	EDD 615*	Dissertation Proposal Seminar (Passed Ed.D. qualifying examination and instructor permission)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
(6) (E)	EDD 616*	Dissertation I - year 3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Action Plan

Based on the assessment data collected, each graduate program shall provide detailed information about action steps to be taken to maintain program quality and/or address identified deficiencies.

1. Assessment Data Summary
2. Evaluation
3. Actions for Program Improvements and/or Continuation

PLO	Assessment Data Summary	Evaluation	Actions for Program Improvement and/or Continuation
1-7	12 students sat for Qualifying Exam. 3 pass unanimously after first round of faculty reviews. 9 passed after revision process and faculty review.	Qualifying exam will undergo review and discussion at the Fall 2016 faculty retreat	Potential revision
1-7	N/A	Faculty and student survey to understand impact of the initiative.	A new writing seminar will be undertaken with a focus on the new incoming students. However, all students will be eligible to participate in the voluntary blended course.